

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

R E P O R T
OF THE
D E B A T E
ON
LORD MOIRA'S MOTION,
FOR AN
A D D R E S S
TO THE
LORD LIEUTENANT,
RECOMMENDING CONGILIATORY MEASURES,
ON BEHALF OF
THE PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

In tali tempore tanta vis hominum,
Magis leniunda quam exagitanda videbatur.

—D U B L I N:—

PRINTED BY J. STOCKDALE, NO. 62, ABBEY-STREET.

1798

Pl. 85-511

DA 949, R46 1798

R E P O R T
OF THE
D E B A T E
ON
LORD MOIRA's MOTION;

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 19.

AT an early hour the House was crowded in every part; the Chancellor could with the greatest difficulty procure accommodations for the Peers and ladies of distinction.

At five o'clock Lord MOIRA rose.

My Lords, apology for offering myself to the attention of your Lordships, would be affectation. In the unhappy state of this country, there is a call upon every man to stand forward, if he thinks that his counsel can be profitable to the country. One may feel the magnitude of the interest that is to be discussed; and, measuring with it the humble rate of his own talents, one may lament the inadequacy of his powers; but one must remain secure, that any effort for the general welfare cannot be unbecoming. This sentiment alone was sufficient to have called me forth. Indeed it would have been a dereliction of duty, which I could not have reconciled to my mind, not to have availed myself of the right of my seat in this house, in order to

make one trial whether it be not practicable to incline government to a timely reflection on our circumstances.

There was, however, a more personal call upon me, arising from the language of the newspapers supposed to be in the pay of government, respecting the statement which I had made in England relative to the affairs of this country. I do not allude to the scurrilities which have been vomited forth against me. I may lament to see any government lowered to such a degree, as to look for support from those vile expedients; but I must, as far as regards myself, be indifferent to attacks of that nature. On abuse of that sort, I refer myself to the opinion of some writer who likens slander to the mephitic vapors in the *Grotto del Cane*, which will smother any animal that grovels, but cannot reach a man who walks upright. What I mean to indicate is the confident denial of the existence of the oppressions asserted by me. The astonishing indiscretion of such a denial could not but bind me to repeat the statement in this place, where it shall be substantiated either by remaining uncontradicted, or (if questioned) by the investigation of a committee. I am aware of the extreme sensibility of the public mind, and I shall, therefore, be most cautiously attentive not to say or state any thing that can add to the irritation of the country. Unless I am forced into particulars, by the charges being denied in gross, I shall forbear a detail which would not only be disgusting, but would counteract the salutary object at which my hope points. I wish to speak the words of peace, and I would fain avoid mingling with them any thing that could defeat their influence. It is notwithstanding, incumbent on me to maintain that representation of facts, on which the necessity for a change of measures must rest. I had stated, in the British Parliament, that very many individuals had been torn from their families, and locked up for months in the closest confinement, without hearing by whom they were accused, with what crime they were charged,

charged, or to what means they might recur to prove their innocence. I stated that great numbers of houses had been burned, with the whole property of the wretched owners, upon the loosest supposition of even petty transgressions; and I stated that torture, by which I meant piquetting and half-hanging, had been used in more instances than one, in order to extort from the sufferer a charge against his neighbours. It might have been believed that I could not have ventured to present such a picture to the public, without having had the facts ascertained by evidence that appeared perfectly sure. At the same time no man can assert that he has not been imposed upon by testimonies, howsoever apparently strong, to matters which he could not himself have witnessed. My first care, therefore, on arriving here, was to renew my enquiry into the truth of the circumstances which I had advanced. It would have given me no common degree of pleasure, could the result of that enquiry have enabled me to come to this House, and profess that I had been deceived. Alas! I am justified in repeating my assertions, with still greater confidence and wider extent: and you must know that I stopped short, when I restricted my representation to outrages of the quality which I specified. I therefore now re-assert those oppressions which I asserted in the British Parliament. If I am contradicted, I shall produce the affidavits of the facts, and shall move for the examination of the deponents at your Bar. Unless I shall be so urged, every motive combines to make me suppress the particulars. Respecting the arbitrary imprisonments, indeed, there is nothing left for me to prove, since the Court of King's Bench has, by its decision on the illegality of several of those cases, established the charges sufficiently. Whilst I am treating of these inflictions, I cannot pass over a misrepresentation which most pointedly affects my feelings. I hope it has arisen from the inaccurate report in some of the English papers, and in a pamphlet com-

piled

piled from them, of my speech. I am stated as having imputed these severities to the wanton excesses of the army in Ireland. Nothing could have been farther from my contemplation, than such a charge; and from no man could it come more ungraciously. Such an imputation from me, ought to have been painful indeed to the troops; inasmuch as a wound from the hand of a friend, is the most galling of all wounds—But upon the very face of the thing, the error of the Printer ought to have been suspected by every one.

The pride, which from my earliest youth I have taken in the name of a soldier, the warm attachment which I have invariably shown to my comrades, of every rank, and the applause which I have been foremost to give to those, who without permanent views in the profession, have generously stood forth to defend their country in this serious contest—all made the supposition of my attacking the military, improbable beyond the common measure of unlikelihood. The charge must have been made by me in such general terms, as would have involved every corps, and every individual officer in Ireland: A step that must in its very nature have been so obviously and so absurdly unjust, as to leave it impossible that a man of ordinary sense could be guilty of it. Nay, my nearest connections in this country, and those the most bound to me by the ties of personal friendship, must have been comprehended in the accusation. My Lords, what I did say was this: That the oppressive measures arraigned by me, were not imputable to the troops; for that I did not speak of casual irregularities, but of a system whose uniformity evinced that it was enjoined by government. And here let me remark the cruel situation in which the troops are placed—I cannot conceive a position more hazardous, and more distressing for the officer, than that in which he is placed in this country. A civil magistrate has the boundary of his exertions defined to him by law, so that he knows where he is justifiable
in

in declining to act. An officer is sent into a district, in which he is told civil order is overthrown, and he is required to keep it in subjection by such means as the occasion may demand. The extent of the actual force which he can employ, is the sole limit to his powers. Prepossessed with the notion which has been instilled into him of the seditious disposition of the inhabitants, he marks his suspicions of them by his demeanor—his appearance naturally awakens their apprehensions, and they shrink from him; their timidity seems the effect of conscious guilt, and is instantly construed by the officer into a disposition towards insurrection, or into a proof of conspiracy. In this state of mind he is practised upon by the malignity of informers; who, according to your system of not confronting them with the accused, can safely wreak their private revenge against their neighbours, by secret charges. The officer is wrought upon by his sensibility to military reputation, by his feelings of professional duty, by his loyalty to his Sovereign, and by his zeal for his Country: and, through the false light in which surrounding objects have been exhibited to him, as well as from the undefined nature of the exertions required from him, the worthiest sentiments of his heart unavoidably lead him into infractions of the law, the necessity for which it is impossible he should measure. Is it upon men standing in such a situation, that I would have cast a harsh reflection? Even had not this consideration remained, that by laying the imputation on the troops, I defeated my own argument, and exonerated the British Cabinet, which I was then professedly charging with all the evils in Ireland, as consequences of the perverse principles of government, adopted by that Cabinet for this country.

But to come to my object. There is not one among you, my Lords, that can deceive himself as to the state of this kingdom: therefore none of you can regard our present circumstances, without the deepest anxiety.

anxiety. How long is the dreadful fever to rage which now afflicts it? You must, at some moment or other, look forward to conciliation—why delay it? Can it at any moment be more expedient? can its necessity ever more imperiously press upon you than it does just now? The time is not yet lost for regaining the affections of your countrymen: But you will not regain them by reproach and threats; and inflictions; and every day's delay, which gives the discontent of the lower classes more time to rankle, adds to the difficulty of accommodation. Procrastination repels no danger from you; but it gives to the designing and disaffected the opportunity of debauching the minds of a disgusted and exasperated peasantry. If you look to the welfare of the British empire, heal your domestic dissensions. In an hour of unprecedented difficulties, England requires the utmost energy that this country could supply to the common cause; instead of which, you leave this kingdom a continued source of alarm and embarrassment to Great Britain. Had she the cordial co-operation of this country, instead of dreading an attack within her own precincts, she might carry terror into the domain of her formidable and insolent enemy. Why is it that France has refused to make peace with England, when every exterior circumstance made such a peace the interest of France? It is that she has thought the British empire vulnerable somewhere; and what mind can doubt that the point is here. Why did France, when she had accomplished more than her fondest hopes at the outset of the war had ever imagined, dismiss your negociator, and continue wilfully to suffer those evils of contest to which she might have put an advantageous termination? Because that in the civil dissensions of this country she saw a mischief which palsied the arm of British strength, and relieves her from the fears which she would otherwise have entertained in the continuance of hostilities. Her hopes, I trust fallacious ones, regarded Britain as a diminished

diminished power, crippled through internal disunion, and reduced to an humble and ruinous self-defence. If the cause of the empire, the cause of our common interest and common glory cannot excite you; look perspectively at home, and ask yourselves what must happen. You will not imagine that you can continue in your present state. Your condition must fall into conciliation, or into settled despotism: catastrophes equally revolting to any liberal mind. If the animosity of your fellow-subjects, becomes fixed and irremediable, you must be protected by the force of England; and that force, from the hostility that would surround it, would be constrained to hold this country in a state of thralldom. Let me ask you how you could bear the reflection of having entailed chains upon your country; chains of which you would feel the intolerable weight yourselves, and still wear the shame? Could you bear to creep about at your country-seats, examining the eye of every tenant you met, to see whether you could discover in it the reproachful disdain, with which he regarded the authors of the national degradation, or to detect in his loathing look the conspiracy which he was placing against his oppressors? Would you not imagine that you heard the plaintive genius of Ireland applying to her Parliament the beautiful apostrophe of the Psalms —“ Had it been an open enemy that had done me this dishonour, then I could have borne it; or had it been mine adversary that had magnified himself against me, peradventure I would have hidden myself from him: But it was even thou my companion, my guide, mine own familiar friend.” And your debasement would not be more ruinous to you than it would be to England. This country cannot be reduced to a state of servitude, without the changes effecting equally the destruction of freedom in Great Britain. Need I ask whether you, men of elevated minds and generous education, would feel your personal security cheaply purchased by an uneasy consciousness of degradation?

And what a security! Recollect what Cicero says on the head of resorting to the protection of troops alone. —“ *Nonne igitur millies perire est melius quam suâ in civitate; sine armatorum præsidio non posse vivere, sed isthuc crede mihi, non est præsidium. Caritate enim & benevolentia civium septum esse oportet non armis.*” But you will say, we will look to conciliation in a fitter moment. When can you have a fitter moment? No, my Lords, if you suffer the estrangement that is spreading through this country to become the settled habit of the people, never will the future attempt at conciliation succeed. But if it could succeed, why hazard all the evils that may occur in the interval? Reflect upon the impression which French force, combined with internal disaffection here, may make in this country; whilst, were it not for that disaffection, you might laugh to scorn every menace of a foreign foe. Were Ireland cordially united within, I should think it indifferent whether a single ship were employed to guard against an invasion. Could France uninterruptedly land on our coasts, the most powerful army which she had means to transport; in a fortnight not a man of them would exist, unless in the character of a Prisoner. Yet this proud confidence, you think it politic to forgo; and you goad into hostility those who would secure to you such a triumph.

I know it is said that conciliatory measures would not now be effectual: but by whom is it said? by those who in that assertion attempt to justify the impolitic rigor which has been exerted through their counsel. Do not admit that belief without further trial. Your countrymen never were insensible to kindness; they are alive to acts of friendship, and know how to estimate a benefit. To the heat of party, and in the agitated state of the public mind, I fear that great misapprehensions, as well as considerable faults, have taken place on both sides. Having stood clear of the current of measures on either side, I may possibly see matters with a less prejudiced

judiced eye than most of those who have been implicated in the contention ; and it is thence that I have derived the confidence of giving my opinion on the subject. Government says that plots have existed, that conspiracies have been discovered, that atrocities have been committed in the country ; granted. And have you not laws to repress those enemies ? If your statutes are not sufficiently forcible for the purpose, why do you not apply to Parliament for provisions better calculated to suppress the mischief ? If there are delinquencies, there must be delinquents. Prove their guilt and punish them ; but do not on a loose charge of partial transgression impose an infliction on the whole community. The state of society is dreadful indeed when the safety of every man is at the mercy of a secret informer ; when the cupidity, the malevolence, or the erroneous suspicions of an individual, are sufficient to destroy his neighbour. I have had proof how lightly the charge of treasonable practices has been fixed upon a district. My own vicinage in the country was repressed as deeply disaffected ; as incorrigibly tainted with Republican notions. Whilst I resided there, it was scarcely possible that such dispositions could exist, without my perceiving some indications of them, or obtaining some hint of them from the attachment of particular persons. Nothing to countenance the suspicion, ever came within my observation, or reached my ears. At last I found out the person upon whose testimony government had settled its opinion of an extensive and populous tract of country—it was one Morgan, a man of the very lowest class, and of a character so notoriously profligate and villainous, that I am sure no neighbouring magistrate would have credited his oath in any case where he could get sixpence by the deposition. At this time some parishes at no great distance had suffered outrages from some rioters. To prevent the evil from reaching us, and at the same opportunity to ascertain the sentiments of the people, I proposed to

my neighbours a declaration expressive of our resolution to support the Laws, to maintain the Constitution, and to defend the Crown of our Sovereign, with the stake of our lives and fortunes. That nothing might be done by trick, I sent copies of this declaration to the several congregations, ten days before I was to propose it at a general meeting. When the inhabitants were convened, the resolutions were adopted with unanimous concurrence. It may be said that such a profession of sentiment was superficial, and might cover the most seditious intentions. I, however, rested my opinion upon appearances not easily mistaken by any attentive observer, and which, when they are in unison with professions, afford the strongest degree of human conviction. There is a simplicity about sincerity, which never accompanies hypocrisy or guilt, and, if I ever read ingenuouſness on the countenances of men, I read it on that occasion.

I ſtated to the meeting the evils that are inſeparable from a Democratic Republic; explaining on the other hand the advantages of a limited Monarchy, which is in fact the trueſt Commonwealth. A marked and general aſſent accompanied the representation. I expatiated on the virtues and benevolence of the Sovereign that now fills the Throne—and who from that Throne holds forth ſo inſtimable an example for the conduct of his people. There was not a voice or a look that did not bear teſtimony to the juſtice of the picture, or that did not join in the tribute of grateful praiſe. I ſpoke to them of the generous magnanimity of him who is the future hope of theſe realms, and of the affection with which he returned the attachment manifeſted to him by this country, upon a melancholy occaſion. There was not an eye that did not beam with the honeſt pride of uniting by heart-felt devotion the favourable opinion of ſuch a Prince! Yet the ſignatures of more than ſeven hundred of thoſe men to the public engagement of ſupporting at every hazard the
Throne

Throne of our beloved Monarch, and the Laws of this country, could not weigh against the charge of a secret slanderer.

The truth is, that government, to carry the point of defeating a Parliamentary Reform, has done incalculable mischief by throwing an indiscriminate imputation of treasonable purposes on all who had associated under the name of United Irishmen. Undoubtedly there is in any association so organized a danger to the public tranquillity, which I am persuaded scarcely any of those who originally engaged in it foresaw. Government however, by designating as traitors all the members of that association, bound itself in consistency to exert against them a violence and a severity which it could not reconcile to public opinion; by the ad-
duction of adequate evidence. And although I am convinced the views of an infinite majority in that association, did not at first go beyond a Constitutional Reform in the Representation of the People, there is no saying now what effect may have been produced on the minds of many, by the charges of criminality so arbitrarily affixed upon them.

I have happened to see something of the management by which these charges were to be supported. Since my arrival here, I have perused the spontaneous confessions of a Mr. Newell, and a Mr. Bird. The latter has also gone under the names of Smith, Johnston, &c. Your Lordships know that the testimony of those persons was the principal support of the accusations against the North of Ireland. I verily believe that those men have made the declarations to which I allude, through conscientious disgust at the practices into which they were seduced. Their statement struck me with very painful sensations; and I shuddered at the thought of the mischiefs which government might have unnecessarily entailed, and possibly may yet entail—If you seize the moment, you will probably still prevent the evil.

These

These are not times for crimination and recrimination: The veil must be drawn over the past on both sides, and both parties must come forward with a generous disposition to bury the remembrance of irritating violences, if a real reconciliation be sought. The manly confidence and good-nature of Ireland must be revived; and the years of contention and calamity must be consigned to oblivion. You know that the temper of your countrymen is capable of this. Never did I meet with a peasantry so sensible to kindness, or so readily guided by any frank procedure, as the lower classes in this country; make your appeal to their hearts, as long as you make it to their fears, you cannot have a chance for success; and recollect that in trying the tone of conciliation, you are not called upon to relax a single precaution.

The maintenance of your military arrangements, and the employment of the troops to support the execution of the laws, is perfectly consistent with the proposition which I shall submit to you. It is this:—

“ That an humble Address be presented to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, representing that as Parliament hath confided to his Excellency extraordinary powers for supporting the laws and for defeating any traiterous combinations which may exist in this kingdom, this House feels it at the same time, a duty to recommend the adoption of such conciliatory measures as may allay the apprehensions and extinguish the discontent unhappily prevalent in this country.”

Were I to cease here, I am sure I should be censured for not saying something on the two great points which have agitated the public mind, and which must thence have a direct relation with this motion. Your Lordships will suppose I mean the concession of those immunities which are still withheld from the Catholics, and Parliamentary Reform.

On the first of those questions, my mind has been long decided. I never could understand the justice of subjecting to disqualifications a majority of the community

nity on account of their religious opinions ; nor could I see the policy of refusing to give to such a body a common interest with their countrymen. Relaxations have taken place with regard to the Catholics ; but they have stopped short : and why they have done so will not be satisfactorily made out to impartial reflection. I can comprehend the reasoning, howsoever opposite it be to my own opinion, of those who say that nothing ought ever to have been conceded to the Catholics ; but I cannot construe into sense the argument which maintains that after having raised them into strength, you ought to keep them discontented. That which remains towards putting them on the same footing with their fellow subjects, cannot be injurious for you to grant : yet to withhold it is not only an invidious distinction for them, but a source of inconvenience which they have very heavily felt. I, therefore think, that what remains to be granted, ought to be granted ; and I give the opinion with the more confidence, after the zeal and ardor which the Catholics of the South had the opportunity of manifesting in the common cause, when a French fleet was anchored in one of your ports.

I will speak as distinctly on the subject of Parliamentary Reform. In what has been printed and circulated as my speech in the British House of Lords, which teems with misrepresentations and distortions ; I am made to treat the project of Parliamentary Reform with unqualified condemnation. Once for all, I must request that that publication may not be received as a report of what I actually did say. The sentiment which I expressed was this—" That I was not a friend to Parliamentary Reform ; not because that I foresaw from it any of those ruinous consequences, on the certainty of which declaimers had rested their opposition ; but because I thought it would not answer the expectation of those who brought it forward—and a change of such magnitude might be attended with embarrassments which no forecast could anticipate or measure."

The statement was not applied to this country; for I read it only incidentally, to prove that I might be considered as impartial, when I spoke of those who supported it in this kingdom. Even with respect to England, I have held it a measure perfectly consonant to the constitution; and I differ solely on the ground of practical expedience, from those who recommend it. When I exercise my judgment on such a subject, I admit equal latitude, and allow equal weight to the judgment of others. Therefore, were the sentiment in favor of the experiment widely adopted in England, I should think that my opinion ought to give way upon this, as much as upon any other point of speculative convenience: of course, I hold it illiberal, at least, to throw upon the maintainers of the sentiment, an imputation of purposes, hostile to the constitution. When I refer to the question of Parliamentary Reform here, I see these very considerations substantiated, to which I have said my opinion would elsewhere bow.

The House of Commons here, representing the people, has recorded a resolution, as to the necessity of a Reform in the representation. I believe that the inhabitants (I speak of a great and undeniable majority) are anxiously and immoveably bent on the object. I should, therefore, say it is impossible for me to argue against it. I own that the probability of reaping the expected benefit, has never been made out so clearly to my conception, as to make me think the plan desirable, even for this kingdom; that, however, is my own humble doubt, which I could not state without great diffidence, in opposition to the general persuasion. But when the concession of Parliamentary Reform, is regarded as the means of tranquilizing the minds of the people, and I firmly believe it would have the effect, all hesitation ceases.

The greatest inconvenience that my imagination ever devised, as likely to arise from Parliamentary Reform, sinks to nothing, when compared with the magnitude

nitude of the mischief which is raging at present; and I say distinctly, that if the fatal ferment in this country can be allayed by such a measure, Parliamentary Reform ought immediately to be conceded to the people.

In the motion which I have read to you, nothing specific is expressed; because it would not be fitting that the House should pledge itself without direct deliberation to any particular measures. The profession, however, of a conciliatory desire on your part, would immediately suspend the agitation of the public mind, and give you time to mature in security, all that is necessary to re-establish general satisfaction. I repeat, that the step must be safe; as no relaxation of vigilance, or military precaution, is required. I am convinced the trial would be salutary: and I am sure it is requisite. In that persuasion, I submit the motion to the wisdom of the House.

The motion was then read.

LORD GLENTWORTH—The motion which has just been made seems to me to be of such a nature as seems calculated to dishearten and dismay the loyal, and to animate and invigorate the disloyal. I trust the noble Earl will not suppose that I mean to give him any personal offence—I have the highest respect for his professional and private character; but I conceive it to be my bounden duty to canvass every public measure with freedom. This subject is not a novel one; it has been treated of elsewhere, and feeling as an Irishman, I am bold to say that its first introduction into the Parliament of another Country, was not to give it an harsher name, “an attack on the independence of the Irish Parliament.”—In the desperate plunges of British Party, I observe that it is a constant practice to introduce Ireland; this practice prevails particularly in the English House of Commons. The affairs of Ireland are introduced by a leading Member of that House into every debate. What was the language of that Gentleman in 1782, when Mr. Eden (now Lord Auckland)

land) brought forward his motion for the Repeal of the 6th of George the 1st? That leader, now so seemingly interested for Ireland, rose in his place, and expressed his surprize that any gentleman, standing, in Mr. Eden's situation, would bring forward a motion which was calculated to lay Great Britain at the feet of Ireland. If I am not deceived by the Papers which I have read, the Noble Earl offered to verify the facts he stated in another place upon oath; such facts, I take for granted, came under his Lordship's knowledge; they could not have been built on the information of agitating Physicians, of factious tradesmen, of the emissaries to treason, or of traitors; they must have been founded on much better grounds; and why did not his Lordship then communicate to the Lord Lieutenant the facts within his knowledge? I have not heard that he ever did so—I repeat I have not heard that he ever did so.

I have read, possibly it was erroneously set forth, that the introduction of this subject before the Parliament of another country, had been attempted to be justified by the pressure of the time, and greatness of the danger; the Parliament of Ireland not being then sitting, and a necessity existing of calling for immediate remedy. To justify this practice upon precedent the motion for the removal of the Duke of Lauderdale from the Lord Lieutenancy of Scotland, had been adduced: The Duke of Lauderdale was a member of the British Cabinet—the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland was not so; the cases were dissimilar. In this reference to the Parliament of another country, was it not indirectly said to the turbulent and disaffected people in Ireland—your Parliament is too corrupt, or too insufficient, to redress the grievances which you suffer, or to entertain the discussion of them. What has been accomplished in the last fifteen years by the parliament of Ireland? has it not given to the country constitution and consequence in that short period? why then should such unwarrantable supplications be held forth?

The

The Noble Earl in his statement seemed to mistake the effect for the cause—the measures of which he complained were the consequences and not the cause of dissatisfaction ; Government was certainly to blame, but it was for not having resisted to those measures sooner. The noble Lord has expressed a wish to draw a veil over passed transgressions on both sides ; but draw aside that veil, and exhibit the truth, and shew that the present war, which is held up as the source of grievance, was not originally pursued as the cause of discontent ; for it neither affected our manufactures, agriculture, nor commerce, which had prospered beyond example. The real distractions arose from the machinations of those serpents-cherished within the bosom of the country, who saw and sickened at our prosperity and happiness ; who like the devil sought to blast the tranquility they could not enjoy, by the talismanick words, Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform ; merely as the paroles of treason and rebellion. Their true object is subversive to the laws, to property, and all the established orders of society ; to change places with their superiors. For this purpose they formed a regular system, and entered into a league with the Directory of France, with whom they maintain a regular correspondence by envoys and ambassadors sinnce the year 1795 to the present moment ; the plundering his Majesty's loyal subjects of their arms ; the murder of Magistrates who dared to support the laws ; of Witnesses who dared to give evidence against Conspirators, and of threats of terrorism held out to Jurors to deter them from finding verdicts of conviction against the most flagitious offenders makes a part of their system.

The late attempt of the French to invade this country, was invited by this society : a rising was concerted which was to take place in May, 1797, in which a general massacre of all who were inimical to their purposes, was to take place ; which was happily prevented by the vigilance of government in seizing arms. With

respect to the burnings mentioned by the noble Earl, I do not justify them, at the same that I think the examples were not unnecessary. I positively assure the noble Lord, that government never gave orders for military outrage, or lenity or partiality to any class of men who disturbed the public peace, but to do justice with an even hand, and repress disorder whenever it appeared. I am no friend to outrage—The doings of the Orange-men have been spoken of—I do not justify what they did, but I say that there was material difference between them and that damnable society of traitors. The former acted, as they thought, for the good and protection of the government; the other to overturn the constitution. To talk of conciliation then with rebels, determined on the subversion of the government and the constitution, degrade the dignity and authority of Parliament, at a moment too, when those very men have envoys at Paris, surrounded by traitors of every description, from the demagogue Napper Tandy to Thomas Paine. There were resident agents at Lisle during the late negotiation with Lord Malmesbury, who saw the French Directory oftener than the embassy did. It cannot be contradicted, I know it is true that there were in Lisle Irishmen, dissuading the French Directory from peace, and advising to demand as a preliminary the total independence or rather separation from Great Britain of Ireland; a measure which they knew would not be granted, and promising them the aid of Ireland to separate and subdue the British empire. Through those agents and their correspondents, were they even regularly informed of the military force of this country, and every local circumstance favourable to the project of invasion. In aid of this project, an infamous newspaper was published, called *The Press*, fraught with the most palpable falsehood and sedition, and which, encouraged by impunity, had recently thrown off the mask, and fully avowed the purposes of invasion as their security, from the “Great Nation :”

Nation;" and advising the people to be prepared. Papers have been mentioned as in the pay of administration—I know of no such paper; but let me state, that though I do despise all oppressive measures, yet I say the Press, that detestable vehicle of sedition and rebellion, ought to be put down, not by open force, but by the strong arm of the law. Another publication, called the Union Star, in which men are marked down as victims for murder, ought to be suppressed. What newspaper is circulated with the industry with which the Press is? You find it in every house, in every hand; and so assiduous are they in the circulation of that paper, that it is given to people in the street. Thank God the Union Star has not been in much circulation; but the Press is forced on the people, it is supported by I know not whom, it is paid from I know not what fund. What does it hold out to common people? It holds out to them the distribution of the country, and of the property of every man who does not think as the directory of that paper think; that every man's property is to be destroyed and burned. Would the French Directory bear it? No; the Guillotine would have stopped it long ago, and if you do not put it down, you deserve what it holds forth.

The noble Earl has mentioned the restrictions laid upon the peasantry, and compared them to that badge of Norman slavery the Corsew. But how can any man compare to that instrument of feudal despotism, the law which obliged the labouring man, in a proclaimed district, to go to his rest at nine o'clock, instead of running about the country concerting and perpetrating robberies and murders? An officer of the Wicklow militia had been ordered out with some men; he had not gone far when he met a body of insurgents; they stood upon their defence at first, till he threatened to fire on them; they then threw down their arms, and ran away. When some of them were taken, they begged their lives, and the officer, with that humanity
and

and gallantry which ever distinguish the brave, granted it to them. If I was situated as he was, I do not know how I would have acted. He had put a rope round his neck, and said he would throw it over his shoulder, but he did not. Has the noble Lord heard of the murder of James King, Abraham Edwards, and several others? Did he hear of another murder, where a soldier of the Limerick militia, who had sworn against some of those traitors; but a contrivance made, thro' the means of the wife of one of them, who was sent to pretend love to him and offer him a purse of money; by her means, unwary, he was seduced about a mile from his quarters, and while her hand embraced him in all the semblance of fond endearments, the hatchet of one of the accomplices clove his skull in twain? Did his Lordship hear of another murder which took place a short time since, about two miles from Youghall, where a man, his wife, his child and servant maid, were barbarously murdered, and horrible to relate, the brother of the servant maid was the murderer; not daring even to spare his own sister under the duties of his engagement? I have still a tale of woe, blacker if possible than all the rest, it is a copy of the deposition of the unfortunate Mrs. Uniacke, on the circumstances of the massacre of her husband and Colonel St. George; accompanied by circumstances too horrible for detail, and which outvies the sanguinary cruelties of the wildest savages. On Tuesday, the 9th of February, Mr. St. George dined with Mr. Uniack. Perhaps he was a man too open in his sentiments, possessing a manliness which he derived from his situation, a soldier of courage and of honour; who had bravely fought for his country, and suffered in her cause. At night as Mr. Uniack's wife was lighting him to the bed room, a man entered the door of the kitchen, rushed by her through the room, and was followed by near fourteen, and the house surrounded by others. They ran up to her husband, whom they assassinated. Mrs. Uniacke
threw

threw herself between him and their murderer, and one of the ruffians had the baseness to give her a blow; they dragged the husband down the stairs, Mrs. Uniack fell by him; she heard a scuffle between the other and Mr. St. George, and while she was lying on the dead body of her husband, they drew the mangled corps of Mr. St. George across her. And to shew the Noble Lord that the system of terror assassination is in its full vigour, I will mention a circumstance which I have learnt since I came into the house; it is the murder of two privates of the Ninth Dragoons who had been seduced from their duty by these miscreants, but afterwards relenting, returned to their allegiance, and were murdered; the one mangled with horrid circumstances of barbarity; the other hanging on a tree! These are acts of desperation and horror that vied with the dictates of the Man of the Mountain. There are men of the Mountain who look on, and there are men who screen themselves behind a curtain and order assassination. Was the Noble Earl apprized of these circumstances before he brought forward his motion? or did he conceive that conciliation and concession were the measures to be followed with such men? It is in vain to think of cicatrizing by such plaisters a wound so deeply gangrened.

All that I have stated are facts that can be proved, and I do conceive that the Government has been justified in the measures they have pursued; if they have been wrong in any one instance, it is in not having acted sooner. Is it with such men the Government is to treat for conciliation?—Are you prepared, my Lords, to treat with those traitors? Let me intreat you to recollect what you are required to do. The Noble Lord knows the danger is not over when you have left the bloody field, there are still acts committed on both sides, which make the mind shudder. I appeal to the candour and honour of that Noble Lord who has so often hazarded his life for his country

try, and I do intreat of him, that if he perceives he has been deceived into error, by misrepresentation of the Government and their measures, that he will shew that magnanimity of spirit and of honour, which has ever characterized him, by owning he is wrong, and that the Government have acted right—and I do tell you, my Lords, that if you do not by vigorous measures put down those traitors and rebels to their country, they will put you down.

The EARL of CAVAN rejoiced that the Noble Earl had disavowed the expressions in which he was reported to have spoken so hastily of the military character. It became that Noble Earl to do so; and as he had done so, he thought the Noble Earl should go farther, and prosecute the printer of a pamphlet published in this city within these two days, and purporting to be his speech, in which this attack on the military was set forth in the most unequivocal terms—a nobleman who revered the military character so highly could hardly refuse them this justice. It had been said of the soldiery that they obeyed orders as soldiers, at which their feelings as men revolted—this he felt a severe imputation on himself and other General Officers of Ulster, who must have first received those orders from Government; and he trusted that every man who knew them had too high an opinion of their feeling to suppose that they would obey orders inhuman or illegal, if Government could have issued them; but he must say, that to his certain knowledge, no orders had ever issued which could bear such a construction. His Lordship said, that the zeal steadiness and loyalty of the troops in the quarter where he had the honour to command, were beyond his praise; whenever their exertions were necessary, they were prompt, and those exertions were often necessary; men had associated themselves together under a name which ought to include every thing honorable and patriotic, the name of
United

United Irishmen; yet, was there a man in the kingdom who did not know they were associated for traiterous purposes? If there was any circumstance which could give him more pride than any other it was that by his Seat in that House he was enabled to declare his firm attachment to his Sovereign and the Constitution—an attachment, from which neither the attacks of rebels, or their anonymous menaces should ever shake him. Assassination had been the lot of many who had dared to manifest this attachment; it might be his:—it was a fate against which no man could guard; it was a fate to which every man obnoxious to treason was now liable; but this apprehension had no weight with him: his sentiments were too much fixed to be altered by it. He would conclude by one observation. The Noble Earl had stated enormities to have existed; why did not the Noble Earl apply to the next General Officer to have them redressed, when he heard of them, instead of carrying the recital of them, without explanation, into England, and detailing them in the British House of Peers?

The LORD CHANCELLOR desired the Report of the House in 1793 to be read—And then continued: If the Noble Earl had read the report of last Session, I should not trouble the House to have it read; the subject now before the House is one which had been often debated, and often misrepresented. The speech published in the name of the Noble Earl, but disavowed by him, has added not a little misrepresentation to the common stock; it has been generally circulated, and has produced much misapprehension. For the military and personal character of the Noble Earl, I feel the most unfeigned respect. I hope I will not be thought to speak ironically, when I assure the Noble Lord, I have the highest respect for his character, and when I say I sincerely regret it has been the lot of the Noble Lord to reside so much out of his

own country; for I believe, if he had been a resident in Ireland, he would have perceived how unnecessary is the motion he has now proposed. And I will put it to the good sense and candour of the Noble Lord, upon what principle the Noble Earl has passed by the Irish House of Parliament, of which he was a Member, and forced his subject on the British Legislature, to call upon that Legislature to interpose with the Crown on a subject only cognizable by the Parliament of Ireland. I will put it to the candour and honour of the Noble Lord, and I will ask him upon what pretence he started up in the British House of Parliament, and required the Peers of that kingdom humbly to beseech his Majesty to interpose his paternal influence to procure the repeal of laws, of fundamental import to the Irish Constitution? I will put it to the candour of the Noble Lord, and ask him upon what pretence he can justify having passed in the English House of Peers a sweeping condemnation on all the acts of the Irish Government and Legislature, both civil and military? On what principle he has done this? On what principle he has represented the feudal tyranny of a *corseu* as established in this kingdom? On what principle has he accused Government of reviving the practices of the inquisition, of urging persons to become witnesses against their friends and neighbours by torture? On what principle can those unwarranted and distorted exaggerations which have been painted to the British Parliament be excused, and which have passed current under the authority of the Noble Lord's name, through every seditious Paper in Great Britain and Ireland?

It has been too much the practice of these countries to drown truth and reason in clamour and outcry; it is part of the party system in England to embarrass the Minister by exacting that clamour. The same persons who played the game of embarrassment against Lord North, by which America was lost, are now attempting

attempting to do the same with respect to Ireland. The noble Earl has disavowed the heavy charge against the army, that the pamphlet passing under the sanction of his name, attributed to him; but he has attributed the treasons which disgrace the country, to the misconduct of the British Cabinet. To cure that misconduct, he has stated that conciliation is the only remedy; but I do ask, what security is there for the accomplishment of the noble Earl's presage? Does the noble Lord reason from the past? The past is against him—Does conciliation allay clamour and discontent? I call upon the noble Lord now, not for the sake of idle declamation; but I call upon him to meet me on this ground, and I will prove to the noble Lord's conviction, that there has been a general system of conciliation, and that in no place has the experiment been so fairly tried as in Ireland, in none has it so completely failed.

I presume that though the noble Lord was engaged in this discharge of his honourable duties in America, he has heard that Parliament addressed his Majesty on the subject of Ireland, and that the grounds of that complaint all related to the commerce of the country. That in consequence of that address, a grant was made to it, of a right to trade to the British colonies, and that the gentlemen then at the head of affairs in England, did strongly express their disapprobation; but the restraints upon our commerce were taken off. In 1782, the opposition Cabinet of the country was called upon for their list of grievances; they gave them in an address to the throne; they declared themselves satisfied; they pledged their lives and fortunes, that all grounds of dissention were removed. One of them received the enormous sum of 50,000*l.* as a reward for his discovery of grievances, and he and his brother patriots were for about three weeks the idols of the country. It was then discovered that the repeal of the 6th of George I. was insufficient for our free-

dom, and a clamour was raised for renunciation. The Duke of Portland in his œconomy, raised four provincial regiments to defend the country, in the place of the army which was sent abroad. Fencible regiments were new in Ireland, and therefore an outcry was raised against him, as if he had affronted the country beyond reparation. Soon after he had left the country, Lord Mansfield gave judgment in a record that had been removed from this country by writ of error, to England: no man will say they could not do it. The Majesty of the People was roused, they attacked Lord Mansfield for it, and they abused the British House of Commons for that, as the noble Lord now finds fault with them. His successor Lord Temple, anxious to prove the sincerity of the British Cabinet, procured a renunciation act in England: I had a perfect communication with him upon every subject of the country. The people wanted something else, they had not yet got enough, they would take an act of renunciation. He recommended it, and his brother brought it forward in the English House of Parliament, renouncing any legislative controul, or bringing any appeal from an Irish decision. Still there was a grievance; the people discovered that the same House of Commons which had procured all these great benefits; free trade, independence, and renunciation; that this House of Commons was itself a grievance; the armed Majesty of the People was appealed to; a military convention, assuming the forms of Parliament, was assembled close to the House of Commons, a Speaker was elected, a Committee was nominated, a bill was brought in, read a first time, a second time, ordered to be engrossed, read a third time, passed, and was sent up by two of the members to the Parliament, and one of them did state, that the salvation of Ireland, that the very existence of Ireland, depended upon preserving the independence of the House of Commons. It met, as it might be expected,

pected, with scorn, and was rejected with disdain, and the members who presented it were overwhelmed with shame, and brought it back from whence it came ; after which the country had some short rest.

In 1785, an offer was made by England, to participate her colonial trade with us, provided we submitted to her colonial regulations ; this was exclaimed against as an attack upon our independence, and by the wisdom of the Parliament of Ireland was rejected. Some respite was now had for a short time, until the lamentable occurrence of 1789, when, in their rage for power, a party in this country shook the constitution to its foundation, and by studiously neglecting the example of England, laid the ground for all that has happened since.—The Marquis of Buckingham, overlooking the personal insults he had received, laboured to conciliate those gentlemen, whom this business had separated from him ; no man took more pains to heal the sore, and I shall never cease to lament, that he was obliged to dismiss some of those servants that refused to agree in his measures. He was unsuccessful ; they were necessarily dismissed, and having formed themselves into a club for redress of grievances, the first of which was charging the British government with a design to destroy the liberties and hopes of Ireland, were the very men who had in 1782 pledged themselves, with their lives and fortunes, to imperial conciliation. They formed themselves into a club, in which they professed to support as their fundamental opinions, the Constitution in church and state, as settled in 1688.—Their pension bill, their place bill, have been past, they were anxious for a responsibility bill, by which the government of the country would be vested in an Executive Directory of five officers, not amenable to the crown, but this was rejected by Parliament ; they carried on their debates with so much foulness and scurrility, with such gross and disgusting language, and bestowed their mutual

tual accusations of corruption so liberally, that what was the consequence? Why the people at length took them at their words, and gave both sides credit for all the abominable and villainous charges they made against each other.

By the conduct of this political Club has the Parliament been debased in public estimation, and the country degraded into that state of cannibal barbarism, which we could hardly have heretofore believed in reading the annals of 1641—and by their clamours against British influence, there has been diffused such a spirit in the country, that it is not merely to the Duke of Portland, Mr. Pitt, Lord Lansdown, or Mr. Fox, but to the British name that their animosity is excited. Agreeable to the practice of the Whig Club, that pestilent society, calling itself an Union of Irishmen, began its proceedings with a manifesto, in which their utter abhorrence of British name and British connection is every where conspicuous; by which it has been held out to the people that they are ruled with a rod of iron, and that the only salvation of the country was in an Union of Irishmen of every religious persuasion: and has their abhorrence still further explained by a letter from their founder Tone who is now a fugitive for High Treason, and was lately an Adjutant General in Hoche's army, and bore a command in the Dutch service, to his friends in Belfast. I have often lamented that Government had not earlier exerted their power to put down this pestilent association; but so it was, that the magistrates were not allowed to disperse them until they had sat for four years, and laid a foundation for all the mischief to which they found themselves disposed. So early as 1792 they had determined to raise a corps of National Guards, their uniform was to be French, and their insignia of disaffection; and it was proposed that similar corps should be raised through the country, and that no effort

effort should be left untried to seduce his Majesty's army from their allegiance, and emancipation was to be the watch-word to this pestilential society. This is not proved either by Newel or Smith, but a gentleman of high worth and character, now a colonel in the army, who was applied to receive a commission in the rebel army, in order to discipline them; and they avowed that their object was a separation of the countries, by the aid of France; that they had arms, money, and men; but that officers of distinction was what they wanted. To provide themselves with more arms, they took advantage of a very old religious feud in the county of Armagh, and set on the Roman Catholics, under the name of Defenders of the North, to rob and plunder their Protestant fellow-subjects of arms. A Roman Catholic committee, sitting in Dublin, had avowedly interfered in behalf of some men who were confined in Dundalk gaol, in order to get them out before their trial on bail, and for this purpose a man was spoken to. This appeared from the report which I just caused to be read; and the consequence of that report has been the Gunpowder Bill, the first of the strong measures which Parliament had found necessary for the public safety. A determination on the part of the Irish Union, to summon a Convention at Athlone, had given rise to the declaratory law, by which the contraband trade of Parliament was forbidden.

In the course of two or three years after passing those necessary acts, what scenes of murder, and robbery, and burning were acted through the country, when no man could sit in safety with his family, when no man's house was a security against the midnight ruffians who assailed his little cabin, or burned his haggard; and who, if he dared not appear, or would not bind himself by that test, which was death to his fellow-creature, he was made to suffer under the system of murder and assassination. It was therefore enacted
by

by the Legislature, that to administer the oath should be a capital felony. The county Armagh was the first place where the abominable systems took their rise. It was there that the Orange-men, as they stiled themselves, being the strongest party, did take advantage of the others. I do not defend their proceedings, but I lament the existence of those outrages. The most express orders were sent down, to put an end to those disturbances; and what was the consequence? The thanks of the county were given to Colonel Cradock, for his officer-like and gentlemanly behaviour in suppressing the insurgents.

It was stated in the English House of Lords, that the Orange-men were sanctioned by government: Little does the Noble Lord know of this country, if he imagined that the government would sanction such proceedings; the Orange-men certainly were not enemies to their country. I have been dissatisfied with the proceedings of government, for I always thought they should have early put down the nest of conspirators and traitors, who have now grown so enormous as almost to counteract the utmost vigilance of an active government. What are the proceedings of those rebels? I will tell the Noble Lord what they are—they are subtle, and it is impossible to counteract them. When a society is formed, and amounts to thirty, they then in their phrase split into fours. Those fours elect each a secretary; the secretaries so elected form a baronial. The baronial, when thus formed, go up to the county committee—the county committee commune with the provincial committee, and the provincial with the Directory; and so secret is every thing carried on, and with such caution do they proceed, that every transaction is committed to memory. The secretary who receives his instructions from any of the higher authorities; if they should be committed to writing, it is merely to impress those instructions on his memory, and he then commits the manuscript to the flames. I
do

do put it to the good sense of the Noble Lord, whether it is possible for any government to counteract the intentions and proceedings of such an abominable nature? I do assert there is at this moment in this country, a regular committee holding regular correspondence with the French Directory. Unhappily for the nation those rebels have spread their abominable principles so through the country, as to make them incompatible with any regular government.

The Noble Lord has made assertions of several enormities which he has stated as facts. He mentioned in particular that one man had been hanged; that fact is not so, the rope was put about his neck, but he was not tied up: as to the piquetting, what was that? Information had been given that a Black-Smith had a number of pikes concealed; his place was searched none could be found; he was threatened in case he did not confess, he said he knew of no pikes, but the information was too strong, he was taken to the guard house, he was piquetted—and what was the consequence? He acknowledged to know where one hundred pikes were concealed, his information was true and the pikes were got. I put it to the good sense of the Noble Lord whether the temporary punishment which had been inflicted on the Black-Smith is not more than compensated by the lives which have been saved by the murders that have been prevented in consequence of this discovery. I put it to the good sense of the Noble Lord are pikes an argument for Catholic Emancipation? Are powder and ball an argument for Parliamentary Reform? The Noble Lord has stated that the peasants cottage was burned—I do not justify these excesses, but when treason and rebellion make it necessary to call out the military, it is not always possible to restrain their resentments. The proclamation issued by General Lake has been severely animadverted upon. To force persons to give up their arms is certainly constitutional, when they have forgotten what they owe to their country and to their King, so

E

far;

far, as to turn rebels to both. What happened in the American war when the Noble Lord was there in command? An Officer Colonel Haynes had been taken endeavouring to seduce the King's troops, he was suffered to be out on his parole—what was the consequence? Instead of behaving as he ought and being sensible of the manner in which he had been treated, he went about the country again endeavouring to seduce the soldiery. He was taken in the fact, and he was hanged without a trial; the only thing done was to identify his person—I ask the Noble Lord was not that a justifiable act?

Has the Noble Lord heard of Waller? has he heard of the death of Mr. Hamilton, a man of learning and integrity? has he heard that he was murdered, because he dared to be active in endeavouring to suppress the diabolical treasons in existence? Mr. Hamilton ventured out one evening to his friend's house. What was the consequence? the house was surrounded, the wretches got in, they swore they would destroy the house and all the family if Mr. Hamilton was not given up—the servants either through fear or some other cause gave up the unfortunate gentleman, the ruffians dragged him out of the house, and murdered him—and these are the men of sentiment, and of feeling, of liberality and of injured innocence, that the army of Ireland has presumed to put down! Has the Noble Lord heard of the murder of the Rev. Mr. Knipe? Has he heard of the fate of M. Cummins? Has he heard of the assassination of the Rev. Mr. Butler? Will the Noble Lord stand up in his place and tell me that when a system of treason and rebellion is in the state, spreading desolation and murder through the country, that they ought to be reconciled? Will the Noble Lord contend that such persons are to be dealt with by conciliation?

I will mention another circumstance: Last summer, Mr. Connolly discovered among his servants a plot against his life and that of his amiable lady—a woman
who

who I may call the paragon of her sex; who fed them when they were hungry; who cloathed them; who considered them as her children—Yet notwithstanding every attention, and every kindness, the abominable miscreants formed a plan against her life, and no later than last summer, she was afraid to let a gentleman sleep in the lower part of the house. I was there—and Lady Louisa Connolly told me she was afraid to let me sleep in the lower part of the house. I saw at each of the hall-doors strong cheveu-de-frize, and as regular a garrison in the house as in any fortified town. And are these people to be suffered to over-run the country without a struggle? What is the excuse held out for their treasons? That they do not act from themselves, but are driven to it by the excesses of the government?

The noble Lord has said the town of Ballynahinch has been represented as the citadel of treason—I say that next to Belfast it is the strongest citadel of rebellion in the country. If I may, without being thought a pedant, use a professional phrase, from their great respect for the Heir Apparent of the Crown, they may be said to be in obeisance during the life of his Majesty.

If the Noble Lord wishes to know the true state of the rebellious system in the country, let him go to the War-office, and he will see the trials of six or seven unfortunate soldiers, who had been seduced from their duty. It was sworn to, that in the timber-yard of the Noble Lord had been concealed a number of pikes and handles; certainly without his knowledge. It is generally the case that where there can be the least suspicion, is the place for concealing those instruments of death. I state this transaction to his Lordship that he may know the kind of persons he has about him, and that he may avoid the fate intended for Mr. Conolly. The Monaghan militia, anxious to clear the character of the regiment, and to express their loyalty, went to the Northern Star-office, to have an advertisement inserted to that effect. The person they met with at the

office, told them they were a set of scurvy fellows. The soldiers, irritated at the insult, and at the fate of their companions, seized the opportunity, and demolished the Printing-office in part; but the commander of the regiment, when he heard what they were about, drew them off—he could do no more. Another party of soldiers, with some yeomen in brown cloaths, attacked it again, and did the business effectually; and they did destroy the Printing-press. The Noble Lord has mentioned the Curfew, and the oppression of making the people put out their candles at a certain hour: A man of the name of Carson had his candle lighting—he was ordered to put it out, and one of the soldiers threw a stone, and broke his window; and Mr. George Crozier, the Noble Lord's land-steward and receiver, went to the man, and told him if he did not make an affidavit of the fact, he should be dragged up to the bar of the House of Lords.

What was the case of Newel? He was a miniature-painter—He entered into the association, and being sick, he did not attend for a short time; the consequence was, that the committee of assassination devoted him to death—he was denounced, and an attempt actually made upon him in a dark lane. Finding he was not safe, he thought he might as well give information of all he knew. Does the Noble Lord know where the four hundred pounds were got that were given to Newel and to Bird? Did the Noble Lord receive his instructions from the Directory as to the terms of conciliation? Does he know any of them? If he does, the government will be extremely obliged to him to tell their names. I know the Noble Lord has conversed with some of them, certainly without his knowledge; but let him beware, they would as soon treat with me as with the Noble Lord.

At a time when the county of Down was in a state of disturbance, a requisition was sent to the Sheriff to convene a meeting of all the inhabitants of the county.

The

The Sheriff, with a spirit which did him honour, refused to convene a mob of insurgents; and in his place a Protestant Bishop was seen hunting for signatures through the county, and afterwards joined his name with that of the mob who signed it, (among whom was a lame mendicant living near the town) in a petition to his Majesty. In this petition these people, with a Bishop of the established church at their head, carried a falsehood to the foot of the Throne. They complained, among other things, that the war had entirely destroyed the manufactures and trade of the country, when it appeared, that on an average of four years before the war, compared with four years after its commencement, the average annual value of the linen was encreased in the latter period, as was also the tonage.

His Lordship examined the greater part of Lord Moira's former speech, and animadverted on those parts of it which charged on the government the casual excesses of the soldiery. The publication of the Union Star, the promotion of feuds in Armagh—of the origin of which he gave a history, allowing that the Peep-of-Day-Boys were certainly the aggressors; but that the others, after peace had been made between them renewed the dispute. He charged his Lordship's calculations of the trade of Belfast with being inaccurate, and put it to his own good sense to reconcile his having made a violent statement of particular enormities in the British Parliament, with his silence on that head in his speech of to-day in this assembly, where the point could be fairly discussed.

With regard to Catholic Emancipation, he asked, did his Lordship know that the Catholic now is under no disabilities except a few, which prevent him from getting into situations of power; that his religious principles, if he were truly a Catholic, must prompt him to use against the established church—and asked how he could reconcile the principles of the British Constitution, as established at the Revolution, with
the

the repeal of the test and supremacy oath, for attempting to repeal which, King James was expelled the Throne.

His Lordship concluded by observing, if it should be the noble Earl's lot to meet with any of the Directors of the union, let him hold this language to them—withdraw your Agent from Paris, and your Ambassador from Lisse—lay down the arms of which you have plundered the loyal, and return to your habits of peace and industry—deserve the favour of Parliament, and you will receive it. The noble Earl may be surprized to hear, that during the late negotiations at Lisse, the Plenipotentiary of the Union was there also; that his name is perfectly well known to government; I know it myself, and will tell the noble Earl when I sit down if he desires it; that this Plenipotentiary, who commenced his education in a seminary of Jesuits, and concluded it in an attorney's office, was employed in urging the French Ministers to the most exorbitant demands; and that if Great Britain had had the meanness to yield to the demands of France, as a preliminary, the next-demand would have been, the separation of Ireland from the British Empire. Will the noble Lord undertake to have the Ambassador recalled? Will he undertake that Arthur O'Connor, the registered printer of the Press, will cease to disseminate treason three times a week, if his motion be adopted.

I feel that I have already exhausted the patience of the House; I certainly have exhausted my own; but I will no longer detain your Lordships than to ask if we give up our power, and submit to our enemies, and if the experiment should fail, what resource, what return will be left to us? And I beseech the noble Earl, when he sees the condition to which this country has been reduced by the artifices of party, that as he values the peace and happiness of Ireland he will, on his return to England, use his influence
with

with the politicians of Great Britain to entreat that they will cease to play the game of party politics in this unfortunate country. The noble Earl does not know the people of Ireland so well as I do; he does not know that there is not so volatile or credulous a people on the earth; that they are ready to be dupes of any projector if he will only profess good will towards them; that they will not hesitate if any man comes with a book in one hand, and a declaration in the other, to take the test, provided it professes to be for their advantage. If he knew this, he would be less surprised at the melancholy influence which words and parties have with them, and he would be more anxious than he is to prevent the increase of so mischievous a practice.

BISHOP of DOWN. My Lords, unused as I am to public speaking, and ill qualified as I feel myself to attempt it, I cannot sit totally silent under the personal attack with which the Noble Lord on the Wool-sack has honoured me; and that in a tone of authority which I am not quite tame enough to submit to. What is this crime that I stand charged with? My Lords, I joined with men of character as respectable as any in this kingdom—freeholders of the county in which I live, and of which I am a freeholder myself. I joined with them in calling a county-meeting, for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of addressing his Majesty, on the awful and calamitous state of public affairs. Where was the crime in this? Where, let me ask, would the crime have been, if I had joined in a call of the county, for the purpose of expressing our happiness and satisfaction under the present system, or to thank Mr. Pitt for the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam, and for the lost blessings restored to us by that auspicious measure?—Amongst the first of these blessings, that of the Noble Lord's mild and benign influence in our government? No; the crime is this—that I, or that any man in my situation, should presume to have an opinion of his own on public matters,

ters, and to act from that opinion. And the Noble Lord not only considers us, himself, as the most abject dependants upon the Castle, but he thinks it right, and wise, and decent, to hold us up in that light to the whole country—for I defy any man who shall know this treatment of me this night, to put any other possible construction on it; to which I shall only say, that if this is his friendship to the church, the Catholics have reason to be happy in his enmity, I do not mean that the noble Lord is capable of personal enmity to any body of men; I mean happy in his opposition to their claims. My Lords, I shall enter into no justification of my conduct; I know that it requires none. If I have transgressed the law, I do suppose there is no want of zeal in the Crown lawyers, to call me to account for it. If I have committed any offence against this House; to the chastisement of the House I shall submit with all due humility. But as to the noble Lord's opinion of me, I must tell him plainly, there is nothing in this world that I regard with more perfect indifference, than either his censure or approbation. He has said that if he was well informed, I carried about the petition for subscriptions. His information was false, though I scarcely think it worth my while to contradict it; had it been true, I should not be ashamed to avow it; I see no impropriety in doing so. I shall not enter into the discussion of the question before the House, that subject is in abler hands; you have tried the system of coercion long enough to judge of its fruits; have those fruits been such as to encourage you to persevere in it? No. From the recall of Lord Fitzwilliam to the present moment, we have been going on from bad to worse; 'till at last we are on the brink of ruin. That the people of this country were at that period well affected, is certain; if any proof of it had been wanting, it was given unequivocally in the regret and concern which was expressed

at his departure, from one end of the kingdom to the other. Had their intentions been mischievous, they would have rejoiced that the man was recalled, who, they had every reason to believe, had come over with such terms in his hand, of conciliation and peace, as must have defeated them completely. My Lords, I must say one word more of our county petition; the noble Lord here asserted, that it sets out with a gross and scandalous misrepresentation. There is not a word of misrepresentation from the beginning to the end of it. Whatever might have been the revenue of Belfast last year, or the year before last, or the year before that, the fact is, that the trade and commerce of Belfast is at this moment nearly annihilated. My Lords, I never before obtruded myself on your Lordships attention; and I have no desire of ever troubling you again; I shall, therefore, take the present opportunity of declaring my sentiments, on two very important questions that have been mentioned in the debate of this night; the emancipation of the Catholics, and a Reform in Parliament. I am a decided friend to both, I have been so to the total and complete emancipation of the Catholics, from the first moment that I was capable of thinking on that subject; and I have always considered it is a matter of *right*, not of *favour*. A Reform in Parliament, I consider as an act of policy which the state of the country renders absolutely necessary. Without both, there is no salvation for this country. They are, notwithstanding the noble Lord's irony on the occasion, they are, I am convinced, the only weapons with which you can attack the discontented with effect. My Lords, I have a double stake in this country; my preferment in the church; and my own personal property, which, though an inconsiderable one, is an object of some consequence to me. I am as much interested as any man, in the tranquillity and prosperity of this country; but this I am satisfied of, that neither my property, nor that of

any man in this House, nor our lives, nor any thing that is dear to us, will be long safe under the present system. The noble Lord has said something of letters received in the North from England, holding out expectations of a change of Ministry; that those letters were handed about, and were, in fact, the cause of our county-meeting and petition. I am totally at a loss to know what letters the noble Lord speaks of; but this I know, that I have not for years, either received or seen any letters from England, that afforded any such hopes. That event, unfortunately for the country, is, I believe very distant indeed.

Lord DUNSANEY supported the motion with much ability:—he shewed that the present system was the cause of the existing discontents in a great measure, and that where the people of Ireland were treated by Government with lenity and indulgence, they were proportionably loyal and grateful. It had been asked of the Noble Earl who made the motion, why he had not now brought before the House a catalogue of those enormous cruelties which he had detailed in the British House of Peers? Instead of being asked such a question, the noble and learned Lord should rather have thanked him for the conciliating and pacific manner in which he proposed to act.—But if noble Lords wanted such a catalogue he could furnish them; he could relate to them not simply the burning of houses, but the murder in cold blood of their inhabitants—he could give them an account of three men particularly, who, after having had their houses burned to the ground, were shot by the military after having been for some time prisoners—and he could add to these accounts the much more numerous instances of men torn from their family and country, and without the form of a trial, transported for life. He declared himself a friend to both the measures of conciliation which had been mentioned—Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform.

Lord

Lord MOIRA, in reply.—My Lords, the noble Baron who spoke second in this debate and the learned Lord on the Woolfsack have both said, that my arrival in this country has produced much mischief and greatly inflamed discontent. If my Lords, so much danger were to be apprehended by my coming, they, whose misrepresentations of my conduct in another country, so widely and so wantonly circulated, made it necessary that I should come,—are chargeable with the mischief.—The noble Lords have said also, that the discussion in which we are now engaged will aggravate the disorders which are already so mischievous—if so, my Lords, they who made the discussion necessary by resisting a motion of conciliation and peace are to be blamed for the consequences. Nothing in my statement could have a tendency to produce such an effect, or in any degree to irritate the public mind. The noble Baron who, in a speech of much eloquence, first opposed my motion, began by insinuating that a something had taken place somewhere, which with respect to this House he did not think becoming—The noble Baron appeared to labour under great difficulty in stating what that something was—it however at last appeared to be my having agitated in the British Parliament some points relative to the subject now before you. But the noble Baron, though apparently much discontented with my speech on that occasion could not state exactly in what the irregularity of it consisted.

The learned Lord on the Woolfsack who followed him, declared himself equally dissatisfied with my conduct on that occasion, but laboured under the same difficulty in stating in what the breach of order or want of respect to this House consisted. Of my attachment to the independence of the Irish Legislature, any present declaration must be superfluous; since I have on all occasions loudly maintained the necessity of that independence as the only security for the welfare of Ireland. I am surprized that the learned Lord, who from his station ought to be enlightened on the sub-

ject, did not discover and acknowledge that the steps taken by us in the British Parliament, were perfectly consistent with the independence of the Legislature of Ireland, and consonant to that spirit on which the connexion of the two countries is founded. The learned Lord as a Privy Counsellor in both countries, and a Cabinet Minister in this, might be reasonably supposed to have known that the Lord Lieutenant of this country is appointed by a commission under the Great Seal of England—that he receives his instructions from the Secretary of State and under the King's Signet—that he is bound to obey the instructions which he receives thro' the medium of that Secretary, a Member of the British Cabinet, and that therefore it is under the special instruction of that Cabinet that he acts. Through what channel then could application be made to correct the abuses of the Irish Executive but through the channel of the British Parliament, to whom only that Cabinet is responsible? The learned Lord might have learned further on the subject—he might have learned that if the conduct of an Irish Lord Lieutenant is not censurable by the British Legislature, the Irish Lord Lieutenant holds a situation which the British Constitution disclaims and abhors—a situation destitute of responsibility. The Irish Parliament has the fullest right to animadvert on the conduct of the Viceroy, and can never want the means to make its opinion on that conduct respected; But it has no process by which when his administration expires it can summon that Viceroy to abide a trial. The jurisdiction of the British Parliament over the conduct of the Irish Viceroy, the learned Lord might have seen ascertained by the highest authority, by Lord Coke himself, who lays it down as a principle, that wherever the King's seals go, there does the authority of Parliament extend. But laying aside these arguments, which from the nature of them the noble Lord might be supposed to know, there was a circumstance which

which might have given the learned Lord a hint that there was not any thing contrary to Parliamentary order in his addressing the British House on the topic ; for he will surmise that it was rather more likely that the Minister should have a number of partial friends present, than that I should ; and the irregularity of a discussion, which could not be thought very entertaining to the Ministers, would naturally have been seized as an excuse for stopping the conversation, could it possibly have been pleaded.

The learned Lord in a very long speech has gone into an elaborate and I will allow an able detail of the concessions which Great Britain has made to Ireland for some years back. I do not see how that detail bears on the present question, but I will say of those successive demands and concessions which have been made, that they were such as in an improving country might naturally have been expected. Every new advantage which Ireland enjoyed enlarged her sphere of action, and made her know the value of, and feel the necessity for others. I will say still farther, that if these were concessions made to the demands of Ireland, they were equally beneficial to Great Britain, for the wealth of Ireland is the strength of Great Britain; and I would say that the weakness or poverty of Great Britain would be the calamity of Ireland.

The learned Lord asks me whether I do not believe that there exists in this country a dangerous conspiracy against the government ? My Lords, I do believe there exists such a conspiracy, and I attribute the existence of that conspiracy to the severe, the unconstitutional measures which government have adopted. I attribute much of the danger and much of the disturbances which exist, to that most impolitic and lamentable measure—the recall of my Lord Fitzwilliam. I predicted the consequences, when I first heard of that measure, and I have been too true a prophet. Both houses of parliament here had declared the measures proposed by that Nobleman to be such as merited the support

support of parliament and the approbation of the public: yet the course of those measures was violently interrupted; the promise given to the nation by the declaration of those measures was unwisely broken; and principles of government diametrically opposite to those which had met such applause from the country, were adopted by the new Viceroy. The system which was continued subsequent to that event, a system of coercion, of cruelty, and of blood, has aggravated the evil, and driven the people to the most dangerous and unconstitutional steps, as means of supposed self-defence against the extreme severity of their government.

The learned Lord had thought proper to allude to newspapers and pamphlets, and argue from what they report as my speech, as if it were really mine. In one of those publications I am made to say what certainly I never said, that the troops in Ireland regarded every Irishman as a rebel, and treated him accordingly. It would have been extremely absurd in me to have used such an expression generally, of the troops in Ireland, for many of those troops are themselves Irish. What I said was "that the foreign troops which were sent to Ireland went thither under an unfortunate prejudice, which care had been taken to instill into them, that every man they met there was a rebel." His Lordship is also pleased to say, that he would not, were he a general officer commanding the army in Ulster, be much obliged to me for saying that I was sure they did not act with their inclination in discharging the late orders of government. I am sure that these officers would find it an unpleasant duty were they bound to execute on the people a punishment legally inflicted. I am sure it must be still more so where they are obliged to exert measures of extraordinary severity. I know too the delicate situation in which an officer is placed, when he is appointed to execute such orders as those under which General Lake and others have acted. I know how difficult it is in such circumstances to avoid being misled by the mistatements, the falsehood or the passions of others,

to

to acts perhaps more severe than the truth of circumstances would warrant. You are to observe that the re-partition of the troops into small detachments, must leave the delegated power to the discretion of young officers who could not be expected to use it with the strict caution and judgment which General Lake himself would use.

With respect to the persecution of the Catholics which took place in the county of Armagh and parts adjacent, I did state that I suspected government of winking at the progress and effects of that fanatic violence, from the belief that those religious feuds would smother the cry for Parliamentary Reform. I suspect it still. The long time for which those outrages continued unchecked by any interference on the part of government, necessarily creates the suspicion. If it be an unjust one, government has at least entailed it by a culpable inattention.

Another of the measures which, taking my speech from the public prints, his Lordship asserts I attributed to government, without any rational ground, was the publication of the Union Star.

I will tell the learned Lord what I did say on that occasion : I did say that, there was something so extravagantly absurd in that paper, something so inconsistent with its professed end assassination ; in describing publicly the names of the persons to be assassinated, by which they would naturally be put upon their guard, that I did think, and I still retain that opinion, that it was much more likely to have been written by the enemies of that party on whom the imputation of it was to fall, than by the party itself.

But of the facts which I alluded to in the British House of Peers, as proofs of the extreme cruelty of the system which was carried on in Ireland, his Lordship denies the truth. One of those facts was the strangling of one Shaw, in order to induce a confession, and his Lordship asserts that the rope was only put round his neck, but that he was not actually suspended. I repeat

my

my former assertion, that he did actually undergo a process of strangulation, and suffered many other inflictions, as well as picketing. But here the learned Lord says it was done to make him discover where pikes were hidden, and that he did confess where a hundred pikes might be found, and the Noble Lord asks is it not better that an individual should have been picketted, or even half-hanged, than that all those should perish, who might have been killed by the pikes? I do not wish to examine too minutely the notion of that Justice, which can defend the subjecting an individual to excessive and illegal suffering upon the plea of its being done to prevent a consequence gratuitously imagined for the argument's sake.

But I will tell the learned Lord, that he has by stating the case of Shaw, endeavoured to mislead attention from the real point in charge. My assertion is that, torture has been used to force a man to accuse his neighbours; a practice standing in the justest reprobation of every writer on morality or jurisprudence; because it has been too well proved that the person, who to free himself from immediate anguish, has inculpated an innocent man, has afterwards through shame or fear maintained the charge, and led the unoffending victim to a dreadful death. That accusations have been thus endeavoured to be extorted, I have the fullest proof; and in one instance the sufferer was half-hanged thrice, because he declared he knew no guilt in his neighbours.

His Lordship has alluded to another part of my speech, and triumphantly denies that the curfew regulation was so rigorously enforced in a particular instance as I was supposed to have mentioned. In describing the severity of so arbitrary a measure, I took the liberty to suppose a case in which the enforcement of it would be attended with great hardship—the case was that of a parent watching at night over his dying child; and obliged in such circumstances to put out his lights by the order of a military patrol. I represented the possible irritation which might arise from such a re-

straint

straint ; and I quoted a case that had come within my knowledge, as illustrative of my general position. It would have equally answered my argument to have merely stated a supposed case. In answer to this, a case has been published with great triumph respecting a Lieutenant Steel of the Cambridgeshire Fencibles, who forbore to put out the lights in a house where there was a sick child. It is assumed that this must have been the instance to which I alluded ; and it is sagaciously concluded that, because I was misinformed on this head, I must be equally so in every other particular that I advanced. Now, that transaction happened near fourscore miles from me. I dare say Lieutenant Steel is a very respectable officer and incapable of doing a harsh thing ; but I never heard of him till I saw the account so triumphantly published, nor did I know that his regiment was in Ireland. The fact to which I alluded happened to one Henry Carson of Downpatrick ; was accurately as I represented it ; and after all is unimportant to the present argument.

But to come to the business before us—The learned Lord asks whether I would oppose the slow process of laws to men banded in open rebellion ? I will answer the question by bidding him to shew me the rebellion ?—and while I ask him to do so, I cannot help expressing my regret that his Lordship deals such strong charges so liberally, and flings the epithet *REBEL* on the whole kingdom of Ireland. My Lords, before a nation be convicted of this heavy crime, and the punishment of it inflicted, there ought to be some proof, there ought to be the strongest proofs ; where are they ? The learned Lord has brought the case of Colonel Haynes to justify the system which has been carried on in Ireland. Let me state to your Lordships what that case was. Isaac Haynes had been taken at the capture of Charlestown—He was suffered to go on parole to his own house—He was not contented with remaining a prisoner on parole—He voluntarily came forward and took the oath of allegiance, in order to have

the privilege of trading, which was then a lucrative occupation.

When the enemy came down upon our position, he residing within it, entered into a secret correspondence with the General of the Americans, and received from that General a commission of Colonel. He then debauched a battalion of our enrolled militia, at the head of which he raised the standard for a general insurrection in the rear of the army; and he was with those troops laying waste the plantations of those who would not join him, when his corps was dispersed, and he himself was taken by a detachment which General Balfour had sent against him.

He was tried by a Court of Enquiry. The commission of Colonel, privily received from the enemy's General was proved, and would alone, without the other facts, have constituted him a spy, and subjected him, by all the laws of war, to immediate execution; but the Court of Enquiry was the only Criminal Court known in the country either by the Americans or us. It had been first used by the Americans in the case of Major André; it had continued their constant tribunal in the southern provinces; it had been adopted by Lord Cornwallis out of necessity: because, by a defect in the Mutiny Act, nobody could order a Court Martial, or approve its sentence, but the Commander in Chief; so that by our distance from New York, all the effect of example from capital punishment, connected with the public interest (the only consideration which justifies capital punishment) would have been lost, since the exigency to which the example was to apply, would have been forgotten before the punishment could take place.

The Court of Enquiry was composed in the same manner as a Court Martial: but it left on the commanding officer a responsibility for the execution that he ordered in consequence of the verdict. Haynes was therefore tried and executed, consonantly to the
sole

sole existing course of justice in that country. It was within the district of another commanding officer, where no order could emanate from me : but by adding my name to vouch for the justice and expediency of the act, I made myself as fully responsible as if it had been my individual act.

Now observe—The learned Lord states this act, which he professes to have been a just and necessary one, as parallel to the inflictions which I have been arraigning, to cases where men have been put to death without any investigation of their supposed crime, without identification of their persons, without any connection exhibited, but the loosest presumption between them and any infraction of the law that had happened in their neighbourhood.

The learned Lord advances it as parallel to the wanton burning of houses, and entire destruction of the property of individuals, on the vague surmise of disaffection. He urges it as a sufficient precedent to excuse the application of torture, to obtain accusations against individuals probably innocent. But what analogy would the learned Lord draw between this case and any which can occur in Ireland ? America was in a state of open rebellion—we had conquered the province, and martial law was the only law which did exist, or could exist there—there was of course a complete dissolution of civil government.

Does the Noble Lord mean to say that such is the state of Ireland ? He ought to know that in Ireland in its present circumstances, martial law cannot exist in any part of it. Would he make the existence of a Society of United Irishmen, however culpable or misled they may be, a pretext for the suspension of civil government, and for laying the country prostrate under a military force ? Tyranny only could reason thus—Tyranny which never wants a colour to give a shade to its true designs. America was then in a state of rebellion. Ireland is still at peace ; and yet I will ven-

ture to say, that there were fewer capital and summary executions in America for twelve months of that period, than there have been in Ireland for the last year!

But the Noble Baron near me has read to the House a shocking catalogue of the murders which have been perpetrated by the insurgents. He has mentioned among them the recent one of a generous and valiant officer—it is horrid indeed in all its circumstances, and I feel its full horror; but do these dreadful crimes furnish any argument on this question? If they do, I will find for the Noble Baron another crime to match it, equally horrid. If he goes on with his reckoning, I will accompany him, and find him death for death! And what would be the profit of such a dreadful measurement? We should only augment the fatal irritation of the country; an effect which I anxiously avoid, and which the Noble Lords on the other side have not shunned with equal caution.

The very statement which the Noble Lord has made of those assassinations, gives the truest picture of the condition to which society is reduced in this country, by the intemperance and ill-judged violence of government; and proves more incontestibly than any argument which I could use, the absolute and immediate necessity of a total change of system. I have thought that it would be for the benefit of the country, as well as for the honor of individuals, that the detail of enormities should be suppressed, because my object is not to gain the palm in a debate, but to render a service to the public.

But let it not thence be thought that I shall leave the existence of those enormities doubtful. *If the noble Lords on the other side shall not venture to deny their existence, that silence shall be held an admission of my assertion; and I will conclude the circumstances lamented (as I sincerely hope they are) and not more lamented than true. I repeat then, if these facts are at all denied—they are not admitted to the full extent in which I have*

have asserted them, I will immediately move that the House shall resolve itself into a committee before which I will adduce such proof to your bar, as will extort belief; and the proceedings of the Committee on that subject shall convey the grievances and suffering of the Irish people to the Throne.

The Noble Lord asks whether I believe a Reform and Emancipation will conciliate?—I think they will. They will give to the people of this country every thing they can want—nor can I believe that after what has been done by France in every nation in which she has had interference, there are many people so mad as to wish to see a French army in this country. The people of Ireland are not so dull. If any entertain a wish so absurd, it must be suggested by the delirium which men are driven to by the severe and unrelenting measures with which Government have pursued them. If that system be relaxed, and in the place of cruel and harsh measures, mild and conciliatory measures are adopted, the people will cease to be deluded. Grant them these two great objects of their pursuit, and even though attempts should still be made to mislead them, the means of doing so will be removed. Let them have an interest in the tranquility of society. In the peril which they now feel there is no result of conciliation that can be more formidable than their present situation.

You have planted penal inflictions like man-traps at every turning of the paths of life; and then you expect individuals to walk with that confidence of security which can alone attach any man to the government under which he lives.

But, the noble Lord asks you can you believe that these men mean really nothing more than Reform and Emancipation? I ask what reason has the House to believe they have any other ultimate and remote object? The proof his Lordship gives you is a letter of Mr. Tone's, in which he declares, when he is
forming

forming a constitution for the United Irishmen, that it is his private opinion, that all they are doing will be of little use, and that nothing short of a separation will be effectual. To this I answer, that it is apparent from the words of this letter itself, that Mr. Tone did not believe that his opinion was that of the persons to whom he addressed himself, nor can I think it reasonable to suppose when men profess to look for objects that are certainly useful to them, that it is not these but others that they aim at. Now, can any man doubt whether the events that have taken place in Ireland for some years back, gave both the Catholic and the Presbyterian an interest in both of these measures? The Presbyterian, when he heard it declared in Parliament itself, that such was its constitution, that half a million had been expended to pacify one opposition, and that another half million would be wanted for the same purpose? Would he not naturally conceive himself interested in obtaining a more economical representation of the people? and would it not be natural for the Catholic to suppose that if any person of his persuasion were in the representative body so many hundred Catholic families would not have been driven from their homes and country without obtaining any help from the Magistrate or the legislature?

The learned Lord asked whether I have considered how far Catholic Emancipation was practicable consistently with the constitution?—I answer that I have—Catholic Emancipation is an ill-chosen phrase, used at present to signify the admission of the Catholic to a participation of the powers of the State. At present there is nothing which prevents a Catholic Peer from taking his seat in this House, but the test in the oath. There is no principle of the constitution which forbids it, and it deserves well to be considered whether the speculative religious opinion of a man should prevent his enjoyment of his civil rights. Nothing more should be required on that head, than
such

such a security from every man, as would prevent him from using the power with which he is entrusted to effect a subversion of the constitution or religion of the State.

The learned Lord has asked, whether I would set aside the act of supremacy. I ask him in return, what has it to do with the case? If as the qualification for taking a seat in this, or in the other House of Parliament, an individual shall give a sufficient pledge, not to trouble the existing Ecclesiastical establishment, it is as much as reason and policy can desire. The Dissenters are professedly hostile in opinion to episcopacy, yet you have not in this country, any test to exclude them from either House; and your Church establishment has never been supposed to incur danger from their admission. But when the learned Lord desires that I will reflect on the nature of the Church establishment in this country, I suspect that I have thought upon it more deeply than he has; and I will not hesitate to explain how I regard its present position.

The primary duty of every community is to provide for the public worship of the Deity. The form of this worship must necessarily be determined by the majority of the society; and, though that majority have not the right to exact from the minority, an attendance on such worship against their conscience, it has a right to require from the minority their contribution towards the support of the establishment.

As long as this country remained a Province dependent upon England, the preponderance of the Protestants as to number, in the whole empire, gave them the unquestionable right of determining the nature of the Church establishment here. When in 1782, you declared that Ireland was an independent kingdom, though annexed by special ties, to the Crown of Great Britain, the comparison of the numbers

bers of each religious persuasion, could only be internal. The principle then which I have laid down, would have left to the Catholics, who form an indisputed majority, the right of determining the mode of public worship. No society, however, can act upon abstract principles; and in all cases, such modifications of theoretical right must be adopted, as the peculiar circumstances of the community recommend for general convenience.

On any settlement at present with the Catholics, we have to say this, “ you find a Church establishment already fixed, the ramifications of which extend through all parts of the polity of this country, and are so interwoven with the framework of the society, that you could not annihilate the one without destroying the other. Now, that would not be a revolution but a dissolution, from the operation of which, all property and all personal security must be thrown as much afloat, as the question upon the form of public worship. We are entitled in all justice to guard against so fatal a consequence; and your interest is as much involved as our own in the caution. Thence we equitably and fitly require, that if we give you a share of political power, you shall on your part, plight to us a sufficient assurance, that you will not avail yourselves of it, to meddle with the establishment, but will honestly support the church, and state as they now stand.”

This, my Lords, would be language which you would be entitled to hold; and the Catholics, from every profession they have made, would cheerfully acknowledge its justice. As a firm friend, not from profession but reflection, to our church establishment, I wish its security to rest upon such conditions, rather than upon the uncertain terms of comparative strength.

But

But says the learned Lord, I am strangely ignorant of the situation of the Country, if I can a moment suppose that the meetings which have been convened for the alledged purpose of petitioning the SOVEREIGN or laying a state of grievances before PARLIAMENT, were merely intended for that purpose. To this my Lords I answer that it is unbecoming in us upon every occasion to impeach the loyalty, and suspect the peaceable intentions of the people of the country, it is not so much the absolute exercise of tyranny, that I censure and condemn, as the peevish, acrid treatment which has uniformly been exhibited towards the people. By what right have you wrested from the subject his constitutional privilege of petition and of meeting to expose to his Sovereign the errors and mismanagement of his Ministers? Is it by the Insurrection bill? There is no clause in that bill which takes away this privilege from the people. I cannot discover any such intention in the Legislature in that act of parliament; and I am under the correction of the law officers of the crown when I assert that that act has not deprived the people of this invaluable privilege.

But my Lords should this unfortunately be the case, should this act have taken away the subjects right of petition; then indeed I do not wonder, at the excesses committed by the people. The right of complaint, and the privilege of petition, tho' sometimes abridged, yet never have been heretofore entirely wrested from the people, and their existence kept hope alive. If you deprive the people of these constitutional resources, you account for their desperation. It is to this encroachment on the rights of the people, the existence of a French party, if any does exist in this country, must be ascribed.

A system of terror, and nothing else, may have driven some of our countrymen to the degrading wish of succour from a foreign power. It is the delirium of party contention, the fever of despair, that must have re-

conciled such an idea to the minds of my generous countrymen; if indeed such an idea has ever been reconciled to them. Could my voice go farther among them, I would implore them to reflect on the conduct which France has held towards every nation that has admitted her to an interference with its concerns. Is there a country upon which she has inflicted her friendship that has not groaned under her rod? Is there a community to which she has extended her assistance that has not had reason to curse the war in which it accepted the insidious aid? No! let the honest pride of my countrymen repose itself upon the resource of dignified patience and temperate perseverance. The grievances of this country will at last be understood and redressed by the paternal beneficence of our Sovereign.

As to those statements of the trade of Belfast which I had mentioned in my speech on this subject in Great Britain, and which the learned Lord has contradicted—I certainly did not take that statement from the Custom-house returns. My information on that subject I derived partly from the communication of merchants whom I occasionally saw from that port, and who in those communications, I have full certainty, did not mean to deceive me. It was a subject however in which error might take place—my belief, however, on the subject was swayed by something more certain than those loose communications. I formed it from the great diminution which had taken place in the West India trade of that port. In late years antecedently to the war, from twenty to twenty-five vessels annually used to be laden from the port of Belfast for the West Indies. As I am informed by an extract from the Custom-house Books, which could be procured, though more complicated information could not. In the year ending January 1797, there were but *twelve*, and in the year ending January 1798, there was but *one*!

The learned Lord has thought fit, when speaking of the United Irishmen, their Executive Directory, and their

their ambassadors, to say that his Lordship thought I was not unacquainted with them. I know not exactly whether he means by this—[The Chancellor rose to explain: he only meant that as the ambassadors at Lisle were certainly Belfast men, he probably might have known them, though certainly not in that capacity—] I do think it is sometimes not very difficult to know the persons who transact the business of that society—for if I am rightly informed, Administration themselves have been consulted with one of those gentlemen, Mr. Nelson, about what terms would satisfy the people. I do certainly not disapprove of the measure—I think every measure which tends to conciliation and final adjustment with the discontents of the country is useful; I only think it proves that Government, though they have confined this very gentleman for several months, so long indeed that I hear he will loose the use of his limbs, are now beginning to entertain less strong suspicions of his guilt.

My Lords, I shall here conclude by once more recommending to your reflection those arguments which urge the necessity of Catholic Emancipation and Parliamentary Reform. The situation of this country is not an ordinary situation, and therefore calls for no ordinary measures. These measures are of such a kind that if not successful they would at least not injure, for in the adoption of conciliatory plans, no measure of precaution need be relaxed. If they fail, they will leave us where we were, which no doubt is a situation sufficiently disastrous. In the worst event, the experiment will give to the House and the Government the consolation to reflect, that they had done every thing which wisdom and duty have suggested to save the country.

Lord ROSSMORE spoke against the resolution, but in a tone so low we could not hear him.

Lord BELLAMONT was a friend to conciliatory measures—but inasmuch as the Noble Earl had said,
that

that Emancipation and Reform were two of the conciliatory measures which he meant to recommend, if that resolution passed, he could not support him, because it was a principle with him never to pledge himself to any measure until it was specifically before him.

At two o'clock in the morning the question was put—

Contents	- -	10	Non-Contents	-	44
Proxy	- - -	1	Proxy	- - -	1
		<hr/>			<hr/>
		11			45

Majority 35

The names of the minority are as follows:—

Earls Charlemont.	Earl Moira,
—— Bellamont,	Lord Dunfany,
—— Arran,	—— Cloncurry,
—— Kilkenny,	and
—— Granard,	The Bishop of Down.
—— Belvedere,	Proxy, Earl Mt. Cashel.

After the division, the following protest was immediately entered:—

Dissentient.

Because that, at a moment when Government has thought itself obliged to exert unusual rigor, it appears the extreme of impolicy not to profess the reluctance with which such severities are enforced, and the wish of Government to conciliate the minds of the people by a gentler course.

Granard,	Wm. Down and Connor,
Moirs,	Dunfany,
Charlemont,	Mount Cashel, (by
Arran,	Proxy.)

The other Lords who voted for the motion had left the House, through fatigue, before the protest.

